

THE ABSURDITY OF ALLAH

A debate between
Ali Sina and **Abdul Rafay**

5/9/2006

www.faithfreedom.org

PART 1

Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2006 15:52:30 -0700 (PDT)

From: "Abdul Rafay" <rafayshah@yahoo.com> [View Contact](#)
[Details](#) [Add Mobile Alert](#)

Subject: A simple observation... and a simple challenge
To Ali Sina

I read your challenge. I read debates. I read the way you are after it. I smiled.

I come up with a totally new resolution that might not interest you because it is based on simple logic and obvious truth. Yet, it is my duty to stimulate you whether or not you respond.

Dear Mr. Abdur Rafay,

I read your messages in *this thread*. I am sorry that I did not read your email. ‘Doubtless’ kindly responds to all the emails sent to FFI and if he thinks there is one that I should see, he tags it for me. Your email was not tagged and so I did not notice it. Anyway, you seem to be a knowledgeable Muslim and I will be glad to debate with you.

You [Abdul Rafay] wrote:

“1. Your so-called challenge is based on RANDOM PICKS aimed to irritate Muslims only (a game you seem to intend to play with human psychology only and not to actually try to reach the truth). This is your first failure on claiming yourself to be based on strong logical grounds. I mean, you would actually be logical if your first challenge was against the existence of God. (You rather target Muhammad (pbuh)) proving yourself more IRRITATED than HAVING FOUND THE TRUTH. For example, if Mr. A says, *“The fish in the Atlantic are dying! The water is*

polluted!", the claim is lame as Mr. A did not go for testing the water of the Atlantic. Sounds far-fetched? Ok... go for this one... Mr. B enters a house and tries to drag someone out of the house and on resistance, he beats him severely. Mr. A says B was a criminal and intruder.... Mr. A is fool if Mr. B is from FBI and holds the authority.... Therefore the point is in finding out if Mr. B is actually from FBI and is obeying the law and not what Mr. B is doing. So when you say, "*Muhammad did this... Muhammad did that...*" I can see no point against the concept of the existence of God ... just some frustration in the tone of the speaker... This is because it was not only Muhammad (pbuh) who identified God. The existence of God remains unaffected regardless of what Muhammad or anyone else does. What I want to say is, "*If your target is Muhammad only, you are illogical when to talk against the existence of God. If your target is God only, Talking about Muhammad pulls you down to such a low level (Muhammad is just a prophet). If your target is BOTH... come on in the right order. Once the existence of God has been proven, proving the status of Muhammad (pbuh) will be the very next step.*" SO... your present challenge is not a challenge at all (if you surpass the debate on the existence of God).

Our goal in FFI is not to prove that God does not exist. Of course, we talk about many subjects and I have spoken about God as well. However, this is not the objective of our site. The objective of FFI is to prove that Muhammad was a liar and not a prophet of any god, whatever that god may be.

2. Most of the stuff you have collected in your ATTEMPT to prove Islam wrong is EXAMPLES of unfaithful Muslims (While surfing through your sight, I clearly observed that your primary target it Muslims and not Islam... Don't tell me that 'it is Muslims

who make up Islam...' You don't sound like a child. I hope you understand that Muslims' actions do not affect the authenticity of Islam... Like the Americans' wrongdoings don't mean that the legislature is wrong). Movie clips, news about Muslims, blah blah blah... Sounds like you are rather scared of Islam and want to show it down one way or the other... by hooks or by crooks... Sorry, not that easy! Challenge Islam and not the Muslims to get a good refutation...

I am afraid you did not pay enough attention to the real message of this site. Here we are attacking Muhammad and not Muslims. We quote the Quran, the Hadith and the Sira to prove our case against Muhammad and Islam. Of course, Muslims commit these crimes against humanity because they are inspired by Sunna and the Quran. So the evil comes from them but this evil originates from Muhammad.

3. You challenged Dr. Zakir Naik? Are you telling me that you would call a surgeon busy in an operation theater from behind and say, "*So is that your mastery? Scissors and forceps and the ailment is out? If you really dare, come to my pharmacy, use my medicine and show me how you tug that tumor out!*" I'm still smiling... To challenge a surgeon, you need to go to his circumstances... But if you want to call him to yours, wait for his challenge and stop beating your chest in a fools' victory... You will need a CPR later when you talk to me... not now.

As far as Dr. Naik is concerned, I have already proven that he is wrong on every account. If you disagree, please show my errors. Please remember that this is not about Dr. Naik but about Islam. It is every Muslim's duty to respond and show that I am mistaken. Dr. Naik is not going to respond. He knows that he has

been caught with “his pants down” and his tricks are fully revealed. He is not going to humiliate himself trying to refute the irrefutable. However, I invite you or any Muslim to refute what I said.

I am not defending Islam... I want to reach the TRUTH... wherever it is.

My challenge is that on the basis of logic, I can prove the existence of God.

Waiting for your response

Suppose you prove the existence of God, this does not prove that Muhammad was his prophet. However, since you seem to have such a big interest on this subject, let us start with God.

Let us go over what you wrote on this subject in the forum.

Theodore M. Drange charges God of claiming to have a certain qualities at the same time, which according to him are opposite to each other and no one can have them all together.

He writes:

“10. The Justice vs Mercy Argument

The last argument to be considered in this survey pits property (j) against property (k). It may be formulated as follows:

1. *If God exists, then he is an all-just judge.*
2. *If God exists, then he is an all-merciful judge.*
3. *An all-just judge treats every offender with exactly the severity that he/she deserves.*
4. *An all-merciful judge treats every offender with less severity than he/she deserves.*

5. *It is impossible to treat an offender both with exactly the severity that he/she deserves and also with less severity than he/she deserves.*

6. *Hence, it is impossible for an all-just judge to be an all-merciful judge (from 3-5).*

7. *Therefore, it is impossible for God to exist (from 1, 2, and 6)".*

I say:

Theodore M. Drange has clearly formed a DEFENSIVE point by misstating that God is all-merciful and all-just at the same time. The Arabic word "ArRahman" does not mean all-merciful, but "the merciful one" and the word "AlAdl" means, "the just one". One might say "All the same..." Not exactly. There is no element of entirety in these meanings allowing both the qualities to be present in One at the same time. Now the remaining question is "How can someone be both just and merciful at the same time?" Simple. Just means according to Dictionary.Com:

1. guided by truth, reason, justice, and fairness: We hope to be just in our understanding of such difficult situations.

2. done or made according to principle; equitable; proper: a just reply.

3. based on right; rightful; lawful: a just claim.

4. in keeping with truth or fact; true; correct: a just analysis.

5. given or awarded rightly; deserved, as a sentence, punishment, or reward: a just penalty.

6. in accordance with standards or requirements; proper or right: just proportions.

7. (esp. in Biblical use) righteous.

8. actual, real, or genuine.

Meaning #5, 6 and 7 apply to the current case to define the Arabic version of the word precisely. This combination refers to

the quality of GIVING in right proportions, to the righteous and deserving. Now for example, A is a good man and B is a bad man. A has done mistakes and has shown redemption while B has been stubborn. Now the principle of justice requires both to be punished at various degrees. Suppose A deserves 10% punishment while B deserves 20% punishment. Now mercy forces the judge to punish A at only 05%, but at the same time, B gets a 20% punishment which is against the principle of justice. So "the just one" and "the merciful one" has the option to punish B by only 10% maintaining a ratio of 1:2 by the principle of justice and reducing the punishment of both by the principle of mercy.

There may now be a question that if B deserved 20% punishment, why was it reduced? Is it not against the principle of justice? The answer is no. Because the Arabic word "Adl" refers to justice that distributes something in two halves which includes at least two people. So it is relative, not independent.

If there is any answer to this explanation, I welcome, otherwise, the charge must be removed.

Your response to Theodore makes sense. You say since God reduces the punishment of all the sinners in equal proportion, there is no injustice done to anyone. Since everyone benefits from his mercy equally, no one is unfairly treated and this is justice.

Very well. However, according to Islam, sins are of two kinds: Sins committed against God, such as disbelieving in him, not worshipping him, escaping from the battlefield during Jihad, etc. and sins committed against fellow humans such as murder, theft, abuse, etc.

My first question is about sins committed against other humans. Does God have the right to forgive those who committed sins against other humans? Certainly not! That would be injustice to the victims. Suppose I kill you. Justice demands that I should

be punished accordingly. Only you are entitled to decide whether I should be forgiven or not or whether there should be a reduction in my punishment. If God reduces my punishment or forgives me without your consent, it is injustice to you. So in this case God cannot be just and merciful at the same time. To the degree that he is merciful to the offender, he is unjust to the victim.

The second question is about sins committed against God. The Quran says that Allah will forgive all sins except the sin of associating partners to him. (4:48) This is unjust. First of all, how can he forgive mass murderers who brought so much pain to countless people and not forgive one who simply thinks Muhammad was a nutcase? Where is the justice here? Secondly, no human should be punished for disbelief. Why? Because we never agreed to believe in God and worship him when we were given life. As far as I know, everyone cries when he comes to the world. We are here without our will. God cannot impose on us obligations that we never agreed to. This is like I drag you and force you into my house without your consent while you are crying, then demand gratitude and payment from you for staying in my home and torture you if you fail to pay. This is not justice. The Mullahs in Iran did just that. They imprisoned and then executed their detractors and made their families pay for the food they served them in jail and even bullets used to kill them. This is not justice and not befitting for a real God. Assuming this world is such a wonderful place to be, which many disagree, no one must thank God for being here because **we have been forced to live in this prison called life.** We did not ask for it and should not be required to thank anyone for what we did not want to begin with.

Thanking God should be an entirely personal matter. Those whose life is full of blessing and joy may choose to thank God and those who don't want to thank him should not be punished for it because they never asked to be born in the first place.

Therefore punishing people for disbelief is patent injustice. To add insult to injury, if you become fed up of your life and decide to end it, you will surely be sent to hell to burn for eternity. This is the maximum form of abuse.

Thanking must always be voluntary. If it becomes obligatory, it is no longer heartfelt. A despot may enjoy seeing his subjects bow in front of him, but do they really love him? Love can never be forced on people. To say ‘love me or I will torture you’ is sick. Is Allah a psychopath?

Again, Theodore writes:

“1. The Perfection vs Creation Argument”

Consider the pair a-l, which takes God to be perfect and also to be the creator of the universe. It seems that those properties might be shown to be incompatible in two different ways. The first way is as follows:

Version 1

1. *If God exists, then he is perfect.^[2]*
2. *If God exists, then he is the creator of the universe.*
3. *A perfect being can have no needs or wants.*
4. *If any being created the universe, then he must have had some need or want.*
5. *Therefore, it is impossible for a perfect being to be the creator of the universe (from 3 and 4).*
6. *Hence, it is impossible for God to exist (from 1, 2, and 5).*

Premise 3 might be challenged on the grounds that a perfect being, full of love, could desire to share his love with others. Thus, a perfect being could have a want, which would make premise 3 false. I suppose the only problem with this is that, if a being wants something that he does not have, then he cannot

be perfect, for he would be in a certain way incomplete. Whether or not this adequately defends premise 3 is hard to say. There is a certain unclarity, and perhaps subjectivity, in the idea of "perfection" which poses an obstacle to any sort of rigorous reasoning about the concept.^[3] Premise 4 might also be challenged. Perhaps God created the universe accidentally. For example, he "slipped and fell," thereby creating a mess, which turned out to be our universe. In that case, God would not have had any need or want in creating the universe, and premise 4 would be false. There are difficulties with this, however. First, almost every theist who takes God to have created the universe takes it to have been done deliberately, not accidentally. And second, if the creation were accidental, then that in itself would imply that God is imperfect (since perfect beings do not have accidents), and that would be another basis for the Perfection vs Creation Argument. Thus, this sort of challenge to premise 4 itself runs into problems".

I say:

God's one other attribute is that He is alive. According to Ali Sina, existences such as love, hatred, anger, fear, want and so on are all the functions of life. Therefore, God is supposed to be the resource of all of these being a creator. The quality of God, Theodore is trying to highlight here, is given by the Arabic term, "As-Samad", which means "the one who needs nothing" precisely, and not "desireless". This is to say that God needs nothing. And that God is perfectly powerful. So He can do anything He wants. So want is inevitable as in Quran, Allah says at various instances, the phrases "illa maa shaa Allah" (But what Allah wants) and "wa lau shaa Allahu" (And if Allah desires). Now the error in Mr. Theodore's analogy is that he has placed an open supposition. This means that since the debate is whether there IS a God or NOT, the phrase "perfect being" is wrong because there are two ends of perfection. For example, in

economics, you regard demand as either perfectly elastic or perfectly inelastic or something in between. Similarly, when it comes to a being, it is either perfectly alive or perfectly dead, or something in between. Theodore's supposition would be true for a god who was perfectly dead.... No emotions, no wants, no love, no desires.... Simply no god! But our claim is that God is perfectly alive. Therefore He is the resource of all that alive beings can have... love, want, power to fulfill His wants and do whatever he wills... Hence there is creation.

Please refute if you can, or remove Theodore's article.

You made good reasoning. However you overlooked the fact that the god of Islam did not create the world out of love but out of need. Allah in the Quran says: "*I have only created Jinns and men, that they may serve Me.*" 51:56. Why does Allah need to be served if he is needless? It is very clear that Allah is a needy god. In fact, his needs are so intense that if someone does not serve him he would punish that person for eternity in the cruelest way imaginable. This is the highest form of abuse. Humans are brought to this world without their will. Most of them suffer pains and sorrows most of their lives and on top of that they have to thank, worship and serve the one who is responsible for their miseries?

Justice dictates that punishment should be proportionate to the offence. It is not justice to torture a person for life for stealing an apple. Assuming that disbelief is a crime, which is absurd, why should such a trivial offence be punished in such a sever way? Why is Allah hurt so much if we do not worship him to the extent that he would heartlessly burn us in such a sadistic way for eternity? This punishment outweighs the crime infinitely. How can we call such a sadistic deity just?

If there are no other gods but Allah, why is he so desperate and jealous? I can be jealous if my wife looks at men better looking than me. This would be sick but understandable. I may have low self esteem. However, if we live in an island where there are no men at all, and still I am jealous, I should be sent to a mental hospital at once. How can Allah be jealous of gods that do not exist? Is Allah insane? No, the answer is that Muhammad was insane. It is a tragedy that a billion people worship the figment of the imagination of a mentally deranged man.

I am much kinder to my cat than God is to me. I feed my cat, take care of him, take him to the vet if he gets sick, wash him and groom him and I never think of punishing him if he does not pay attention to me. As a matter of fact, my cat thinks he owns the house and I am his servant. He owes his entire existence to me. Without my care and protection, he will not survive. Despite that he never thanks me and I still love him. Let us say God created me. But he does not take care of me. I am left in this world to fend for myself. I have faced calamities that could have been avoided if God was looking over my shoulders. I would die of hunger if I do not earn my own bread. Tens of thousands of children die every day of hunger. Where is this loving god to come to their rescue? He is nowhere to be found when we are in need. Our prayers and supplications are never heard. I am by all means kinder to my cat than God is to me. And yet I can love my cat unconditionally without wanting him to worship me or thank me. God is incapable of loving his creation unconditionally. He put us in this world without consulting us. Here we have to face life with all its difficulties and pains on our own. He takes away our loved ones and fills our hearts with great sorrow. He shatters our hopes. He sends one calamity after another and kills innocent people by thousands and despite all that he wants us to worship him and serve him. Why should we thank such a god? What do we owe him? We owe him nothing! He does not deserve our

respect. Such a needy, petulant and abusive god deserves our scorn. The god of Muhammad is sick. He is a psychopath.

The truth is that Allah is Muhammad's own alter ego. He is everything the narcissist Muhammad wanted to be. He does what he pleases and he responds to no authority above him. He wants to be worshipped, obeyed and feared. This is the wet dream of all narcissists. One must be naïve to believe that the maker of this universe is this insane god described by Muhammad. Why would one who owns this magnificent universe care if a bunch of evolved apes in this tiny plant worship him or not? Can we really hurt the feelings of the maker of this vast universe by simply disbelieving in him? There are many holes in the concept of god as defined by the illiterate self-proclaimed prophet of Arabia.

This is not to say that God does not exist. I am not a materialist. I believe God is the Principle underlying all things. God is a non-being and this non-being is the mother of all beings. God is an immutable eternal law without which nothing can exist. All I want to prove is that Muhammad was indeed an ignorant man, who had no understanding of God whatsoever. Attributing human qualities to God is utmost ignorance. To say God is just, merciful or compassionate is stupid. How can an indefinable and incomprehensible reality have human attributes? God is beyond good and bad. God is not a thing and as such It can have no attributes. Only things have attributes. Principles do not have attributes. God cannot be living because life is a function of beings. God is not a being. It is not made of anything - not of matter and not of spirit. It has no essence, no substance. God is HOW. How things are made, how the universe works, how life comes to be and how it ends. God is HOW and everything else is WHAT. That is all there is - HOW and WHAT.

Muhammad was an ignorant man. Allah was a Pagan deity, invented by very primitive people. These people thought that the highest expression of power is despotism. So the qualities that

they attributed to their gods were those of a despot. Muhammad, being a narcissist, loved to impersonate this despot and become a god or his sole intermediary. Becoming godlike is the wet dream of every narcissist. That is why Muhammad's Allah is capricious, arbitrary, willful and wanton. The concept of Allah is utterly stupid. It is not befitting for rational people in this day and age to believe in such a primitive deity.

God is not “he” but “it”. Attributing gender to God is humanizing It and this is sheer ignorance of the nature of God. God is not the creator of the universe, but the law of creation. God does not love. It does not create. It does nothing at all. Doing subjects the doer to time. Without time no action can take place. God can't be subjected to time because It is beyond time and space. It is a logical absurdity to say that God is the creator. God is the law that gives order to the universe and makes it run. God is manifest in every atom, in every minute particle forming this universe and wherever there is order. And yet It is nowhere to be found. God is not a person, not a being, not a thing. It is the Principle underlying all things. It is a reality, the ultimate Reality.

Part II

7/9/2006

Abdur Rafay: Alright. So, here is my response, which must be publicly displayed in the debate if you actually dare face the truth. If you don't issue it, the conclusion is that you are not for a debate at all and the debates on your main site are fake and lame. Hence you have no substance:

Ali Sina: Please spare us the bombast and get to the point.

A. You wrote: "*Suppose you prove the existence of God, this does not prove that Muhammad was his prophet. However, since you seem to have such a big interest on this subject, let us start with God*".

Before starting to answer, I would like to clarify that talking about Muhammad (pbuh) being (or not being) God's prophet needs a logical supposition that there is a God. It is just like saying, "This light is not coming from the sun" means that the source of the light is not the sun but something else. However, a debate on "Whether the light is coming from the sun" needs both the parties to believe that there is a sun. So, from the statement above, one understands that your website begins with the assumption that there is a God. If this is true, your website is supposed to have material against Muhammad only and not against God. If it is not true, the target of the website must be God only. Because only if there is a God, does the question whether something Muhammad (pbuh) did was right or wrong arise. If the aim your site is somewhere in between, where is it? So your answer to my mail must be based on its relevance to the objective and not merely on "my interest on this subject" as you wrote above. Agreed?

My objective is not to disprove the existence of God or talk about Its nature. My goal is to prove that Muhammad was a lair, an impostor, a charlatan or a psychopath. For the sake of argument, let us agree with whatever is your definition of God. With that assumption I can prove that Muhammad was not a prophet of the god you are talking about. So this is not about God but about Muhammad. The question is whether Muhammad was from God or from Satan. The discussion of God, therefore, is irrelevant. I have not started this site to convince people to change their faith in God but to combat the threat of Islam.

B. I like the way you protest against an authority. But it is natural... human... yet immature. Let us first look at the demand of justice. Justice is meant to sustain peace. Peace, for instance, is effective when NO ONE KILLS ANOTHER. But once it has been done, justice demands it to be taken back. Since a killed man cannot be put back to life, the only thing Law can do is punish the killer. Does it pay back to the one who was killed? No. He's gone and that's it. Does it pay back to the relatives of the killed one? No. They have lost him and that's it. Where is the so called justice? What the justice, therefore, means is mere compensation. Now the compensation that makes the killed individual and his relatives as happy as they were before the murder will be the actual justice which, as you know, is impossible on the face of the earth. However, this is not true in all situations. A theft for instance CAN BE recompensed by **a)** returning the stolen goods to the original owner, **b)** charging the thief for a monetary compensation of the trouble he created and **c)** punishment to warn him of any future crime.

The result is that some actions can be recompensed while others cannot be, due to the limitations of human powers. Punishment, as the above example shows, DOES NOT DO JUSTICE. It only WARNS the criminal and gives a LITTLE SATISFACTION to the ego (or whatever you may call it) of the victim. Hence, if there is a compensation that makes the affected as happy as they were before the crime was committed, there is NO NEED OF A PUNISHMENT for the criminal. This is to say that if a criminal is FORGIVEN and the affected are still happy with the compensation, the effect can be called pure justice.

As we noted above that this perfect compensation is possible in some cases and not in all, and we see that this is because of the limitations of human power, someone having unlimited powers can easily do it. Hence God has the authority to forgive anyone for anything and still do justice with all.

Though it serves as the answer, yet it must be noted that this answer has come out of my limited knowledge and logic, while God has much much greater powers and options that even I (or anyone else) cannot reach.

The fact that this answer has come from your limited logic is quite clear. You simply failed to address the question.

If you maim me, I will take you to the court to demand justice. If the judge decides to show his mercy to you and let you go free for any reason, justice is not served. **God as a judge has no right to be merciful to someone who has wronged another human being** without that person's consent; otherwise he has failed to do justice to the victim.

How Allah dares to be so unforgiving of those who simply do not worship him and be so generous and merciful to those who actually wrong other humans? This is double standard. He says that he will forgive all sins, including the sin of genocide but will not forgive the "sin" of associating a partner to him. Is he nuts? Does this mean that the pains of countless people are not as important to this narcissist psychopath Allah as his own pride? Does such an unjust god deserve praise? Of course not! He deserves our scorn. Only a fool would think Allah is God. Allah, if not the figment of the sick mind of Muhammad, is Satan.

The truth is that it is not Allah who is so desperate to be worshiped. It was Muhammad hiding behind Allah that was speaking. It was this sick man who could not tolerate rejection and could not forgive anyone saying no to him that was so unforgiving of dissent. Allah was only a tool for this psychopath. This narcissist could not ask people to obey him and worship him. No one would have done it. So he used Allah to get what he wanted. This is clear as the sun.

Imagine someone kills your entire family and you go to the court to seek justice. The judge forgives the murderer because he feels merciful on that day. You cry out in pain that justice has not been served. The judge then orders your arrest and condemns you to life in prison with torture because you have questioned his authority. Does such a judge deserve to occupy his bench? Certainly not! He must be thrown out of the court and taken to mental hospital. That is what we should do to Allah. We must kick this sick deity out of his throne and send him to hell of oblivious where he belongs. But since Allah is only a fairytale, actually those who believe in him must be sent to mental hospital.

C. You wrote: “*The second question is about sins committed against God. The Quran says that Allah will forgive all sins except the sin of associating partners to him. (4:48) This is unjust. No human should be punished for disbelief. Why? Because we never agreed to believe in God and worship him when we were given life. We are here without our will. God cannot impose on us obligations that we never agreed to. This is like I force you to come to my house without your consent, then demand payment from you for staying in my home and torture you if you fail to pay. This is not justice. The Mullahs in Iran did just that. They imprisoned and then executed their detractors and made their families pay for the food they served them in jail and even bullets used to kill them. This is not justice and not befitting of a real God. Assuming this world is such a wonderful place to be, which many disagree, no one must thank God for being here because we have been forced to live in this prison called life. We did not ask for it and should not be required to thank anyone for what we did not want to begin with.*

“*Thanking God should be an entirely personal matter. Those whose life is full of blessing and joy may choose to thank God and*

those who don't want to thank him should not be punished for it because they never asked to be born in the first place. Therefore punishing people for disbelief is patent injustice.

"Thanking must always be voluntary. If it becomes obligatory it is no longer heartfelt. A despot may enjoy seeing his subjects bow in front of him, but do they really love him? Love can never be forced on people. To say love me or I will torture you is sick. Is Allah a psychopath?"

What a self-contradicting statement! On one hand, you admit that YOU WERE NOT BORN OUT OF YOUR OWN WILL, (hence powerless) and on the other hand, you show your protest against God's decision of punishing the non-believers (trying to demonstrate power) -- quite childish. I have something to ask:

Since we had no say in coming to this world and have been forced here by God, it is utter injustice that he ask us to do things that we never agreed to do in the first place. This is not difficult to understand. Even with your little logic you should be able to understand it. If God gave us freedom, he should respect that freedom and not punish us for disagreeing with him, otherwise what freedom is that?

It is like holding someone as hostage and telling him 'you are free to go but if you try to leave, I will shoot you in the back'. Saddam Hussein used to hold "free" referendums. The question asked was: "*Do you want Saddam to stay?*" The Iraqis were asked to vote "Yes" or "No" in an open ballot. If they voted 'No', they would have voted for their death.

Looks like Allah is no better than Saddam Hussein. This is exactly the kind of freedom Allah is giving to people. He gives them freedom but if they exercise that freedom, he will burn them in hell. This is psychopathology. Only a fool can believe in such a sick deity? Of course, God is not like that. The Islamic Allah is

the figment of the narcissistic mind of Muhammad. It is Muhammad who is talking in the Quran not Allah.

Is it by one's will to be admitted in a school? Then, in a higher class, when he is given a low score in a subject, does he say to the school administration, "And was it me to ask you to give me admission in your school?"

This is a non sequitur argument. A child goes to school by his own (or his parents') decision. As he grows, he realizes that for him to succeed in life he needs the education. To learn and score well he has to study. This no different from being employed in a company – to get paid you must work. You can't expect pay without working. It is fair to fail a student who does not study and to fire an employee who does not work. Getting good marks or the paycheck is not a birthright. One must work for them to deserve them.

The point is that study and work are voluntary. If a child does not wish to go to school, no one is going to punish him. Many kids drop out of school and that is their choice. Also if you don't want to work, no one is going to punish you. You choose to be poor and some people prefer that to working. If you don't study or don't work, you deprive yourself of a lot of privileges but you won't be punished for not working or not studying.

In contrast, we are brought to this world without our consent and we do not have the option to quit living if we don't like life. According to Muhammad, the punishment for suicide is hell. Since our coming to this world has not been voluntary, we are here as hostages. We generally like life, but that is because we have no other experience. An animal born in captivity does not know what freedom is. This does not change the fact that he is a captive. This life is the only existence we know about. How can

we know it is good or bad when there are no other points of comparison? Despite that we know that life is not easy. It comes with a lot of pains and sorrows.

To add insult to injury, our hostage taker forces us to thank him and if we decide not to do it, he will burn us for eternity. Only people with very low intelligence can believe in such a crazy deity. Assuming that God exists, Allah is not It.

All these asinine concepts show that Muhammad was a very ignorant and unenlightened person. A crackpot like him could not have been a messenger of God.

- a) if YES, it is quite childish (or isn't it?)
- b) if NO, then why "fight" God who is the most powerful and authoritative and a teacher or a school administration is nothing as compared to God
- c) if you say that our parents know that it is good for us for our future, I would say God knows what is good for all the creation for their future because God has created causes and effects
- d) if you say that when we grow up, we realize why our parents had us admitted in schools, I would say, when we die, we will know why we were created by God without our wills (or maybe with our wills that we must have forgotten or been made to forget deliberately, again of our will). This can be explained with the example of a child who asks for chocolate and his mother doesn't allow him some. He thinks he deserves it and his mother has NO RIGHT to stop him from eating chocolate. That's why he cries and protests. To his limited logic, world seems to come to an end (compare it with your fear of the concept of punishment for eternity). But then he DOES grow up. He DOES in the world. And he DOES come across new dimensions of thought that he has NEVER been across earlier. Hence there are dimensions that we are unaware of and Allah says we will come across them soon.

Only then shall we be able to realize the ultimate truth. Allah says in Attakaathur, “*thumma latara wunna ha ainal yaqeen.*” Translation: ...then you will see it with the eye of belief...

So I conclude that what you proposed was childish. And quite opposite to your claim of the capacity of a man to be a prophet unto himself, your vision is quite limited.

You are not addressing the question that I raised, and all these silly examples of yours have nothing to do with it. All you say is that you have no answer and you want me to believe in these crazy arguments of yours because as you say the answer will be given after I am dead. I am sorry. That is not good enough for intelligent humans. If you have no satisfactory answers now, your gobbledegook is no different from thousands other waffles people believe in all corners of the world. Only a fool would believe in something illogical, trusting that he would find the answer when he dies. When we die, it is too late. What if we die to find out that this man who told us all these harebrained stories was an impostor and he himself is burning in hell? What would you do if you die and are sent to hell to find Muhammad being tortured like a roasted pig over bonfire?

You may ask why you should be sent to hell. My answer is because you betrayed the gift of intelligence that God gave you. God gave all of us intelligence to use, so we can unravel its mysteries and you are not using that gift. This is in my opinion the greatest sin we humans can commit. Instead of using your intelligence, you choose to follow a criminal liar and fill your heart with the hatred of mankind. What sin can be bigger than that?

You wanted to debate with me to answer my charges against Muhammad and prove that Islam is a true religion. If you did not

have answers, why did you insist so much on debating and making a fool of yourself?

D. You wrote: "*You made good reasoning. However you overlooked the fact that the god of Islam did not create the world out of love but out of need. Allah in the Quran says: "I have only created Jinns and men, that they may serve Me." 51:56 Why Allah needs to be served if he is needless? It is very clear that Allah is a needy god. In fact his needs are so intense that if someone does not serve him he would punish that person for eternity in the cruelest way imaginable. This is the highest form of abuse. Humans are brought to this world without their will. Most of them suffer pains and sorrows most of their lives and on top of that they have to thank, worship and serve the one who is responsible for their miseries?"*

Although the teacher-student example I gave above is enough to answer the childish statement in the last four lines above, there is one more point you made that god is needy.

I am afraid you fail to understand the difference between 'need' and 'want'. Even a school child knows that needs are limited and wants are unlimited. Without the fulfilment of a need one CANNOT survive while without wants, there is NO HARM TO SURVIVAL. Now look at this:

1. A poor man is not powerful or proud or authoritative because he is characterized by needs and wants with the power to fulfill only a few fundamental needs and no power to fulfill wants. He IS needy.

2. A middle class man is somewhat powerful, relatively proud and a bit authoritative because he has the power to fulfill all the basic needs and may have gained some power to fulfill some of his wants and has developed more wants. He is not needy.

3. A rich man is more powerful, more proud, more authoritative because he has comparatively more power to fulfill all his needs and many of his wants. He is not needy.

God, however, has no needs and the power to fulfill all his wants such as creating man and djins for his service, worship or whatsoever. This is to say that even if God had not created us, He would be there and hence He is not needy. And you can see that the concept of neediness (in the worldly sense) was over in just point number 2 above. Your hypothesis of a needy god is just baseless and ridiculous.

You are going in circles and not addressing the points that I have raised. It is clear that you have no answers. I asked you a very simple question. If God is not needy, why is he so offended if humans do not worship him to the extent that he would punish them? The question is simple. If you are not capable of understanding this simple question, why do you want to debate with me?

If there was only reward for worshipping and no punishments for not worshipping, then you could have a point. Let us say a wealthy man offers rewards to anyone who writes essays praising him. Let us not get into his motivations. He could have a big ego, seeking self aggrandizement, etc. That is not the point here. The point is that you do something for him and he rewards you for that. That is fair deal. But if he demands everyone to praise him or his henchmen would beat to death those who don't, then we are dealing with a very sick and dangerous person. When Allah says that he will never forgive those who disbelieve in him, it is clear that he is a sick deity. Could it be that Allah is actually Satan? Only Satan can have such a gigantic ego and be so ruthless. Certainly these qualities are not befitting for the maker of this universe.

You wrote: “*Justice dictates that punishment should be proportionate to the offence. It is not justice to torture a person for life for stealing an apple. Assuming that disbelief is a crime, which is absurd, why should such a trivial offence be punished in such a sever way? Why is Allah hurt so much if we do not worship him to the extent that he would heartlessly burn us in such a sadistic way for eternity? This punishment outweighs the crime infinitely. How can we call such a sadistic deity just?*”

Quite ridiculous again. You say, “*Justice dictates that punishment should be proportionate to the offence.*” If you answer my following questions PROPORTIONATELY, I shall admit you have some substance:

You have consistently failed to answer the questions that I raised and all you can say is “ridiculous”. That does not give you an edge. It only shows you are not an intellectual and I made a mistake in my assessment of you.

My question: What is a proportionate punishment? How do you measure offence? What is the unit of these measurements? Is it something like ‘utils’ to measure utility? How do you make sure that one of the punishments given to a thief who has consumed the stolen goods worth 1 million dollars in America or in Saudi Arabia or in Libya is proportionate? Or one is light and the other is heavy? Is it just based on the agreement that a majority has reached? What if the whole majority is making injustice with the poor individual thief who may have some obligation under which he committed the theft?

This has nothing to do with my point. Let us say the punishment for murder is one day in hell or one million years in hell. That is not what I am talking about. I am trying to show the

irrationality of the belief that God can be merciful and just at the same time. Let us say the punishment of murder is ten units of torture. Why ten units? Because God has decided this is the just measure of punishment for this crime. Does he have the right to give discounts to some people because he feels merciful towards them? No, he has no such rights because I am the victim and I demand that justice be done fully. Only I can forgive my killer. If God is going to forgive my killer, he is doing injustice to me. Imagine a man kills your son and the judge decides to be merciful and sets him free or gives him very light sentence. Won't you feel betrayed and wronged? Justice means getting fair trial and fair retribution. How can God forgive my murderer and not forgive someone who does not believe in him? This is sick.

How, finally, do you measure the **BIGNESS** of a crime? Especially the sins made against God? For instance, how big is the sin of disbelief? If you say that the severity of a crime is determined by its effect, can you tell me exactly what the effect of disbelief is? How many people does it affect? What are the consequences of spreading disbelief?

That is a question that you should answer, not me. In my opinion, disbelief does not harm anyone. It does not affect other humans and it does not affect God. The fact that it does not affect other humans is clear. If you say that it affects God, then you are admitting that God is a petty and miserable god. A god that is affected by the belief and disbelief of humans is not worthy of praise. He is a sick, needy and worthless god.

Also, do you know what eternity is? I bet not. Because a human being even doesn't know what the beginning of time is, what to talk of eternity. A human mind is not capable of

circumscribing infinity. It's again like a child trying to play with an electrical appliance and an elder warning him of the risk.

This has nothing to do with our discussion.

You wrote: "*If there are no other gods but Allah, why is he so desperate and jealous? I can be jealous if my wife looks at men better looking than me. This would be sick but understandable. However, if we live in an island where there are no men at all, and still I warn my wife that if she looks at other men I will beat her and punish her I should be sent to a mental hospital at once. How can Allah be jealous of gods that do not exist? Is Allah insane? No, the answer is that Muhammad was insane. It is a tragedy that a billion people worship the figment of the imagination of a mentally deranged man*".

Your example of your lady wife above is WRONG. I bet you would definitely scold and threat her if in such an island she tries to develop sexual relationship with trees, stones, your gatepost and your puppy. Won't you say that it's only you who is her husband and not the things she is trying to make out with? Now look at your text above and decide who is insane?

You fail to grasp what I say. My question is: why is Allah so jealous if humans worship gods that do not exist? If my cat meows to the refrigerator because he thinks it is the refrigerator that feeds him and not me, I will not punish him. A deity that will not forgive those who pray to imaginary gods is an insane god. Let us say a person likes to worship a stone (Actually Muslims do worship a stone), why this should be so offensive to God? Why he should burn people who want to worship trees, stones or animals? Does he feel jealous? Does he feel threatened?

Compare this sadistic attitude of Allah to what Krishna said. According to the Bhagavad-Gita, the god Krishna claims that it does not matter which god human beings worship; it is Krishna who answers their prayer.

I am not convinced that prayers are anything more than powerful placebos. However, rationally speaking, I can see the beauty of this Hindu belief. Krishna sounds like a real God of compassion and love while Allah sounds like a psychopath. Krishna is a self assured god who cares about his creation and responds to their needs, even if they do not know him. Allah on the other hand is a narcissist, who is only concerned about his own gigantic ego. He is ruthless and unforgiving of those who ignore him.

You wrote: "*I am much kinder to my cat than God is to me. I feed my cat, take care of him, take him to the vet if he gets sick, wash him and groom him and I never think of punishing him if he does not pay attention to me. As a matter of fact my cat thinks he owns the house and I am his servant. He owes his entire existence to me. Without my care and protection he will not survive. Despite that he never thanks me and I still love him*".

Yes, you do. Because you have not created it for something you wanted it to do. So this example is also **WRONG**.

What a load of nonsense! Who said by virtue that God created us he has the right to torture us? Did he consult us before creating us? Did we agree to the deal that we would worship him if he creates us? I have no recollection of agreeing to such a deal or signing any covenant with my alleged creator. He created without my will and gave me feelings. He has no right to hurt my feelings or mistreat me.

Here is the right example:

You create a software. Instead of calculating profit for you, it is producing meaningless digits. You try to handle it, but it doesn't seem to work. What do you do? Love it? Caresse it? Keep it in a directory? Look after it daily and smile at it? Or simply delete it and start a new one?

Software has no feelings and do not sense pain. You can destroy a car, a computer or anything that you create. Of course if you pound at them year after year with revenge, we would question your sanity. Nonetheless we humans have feelings and can sense pain. We can't be compared to a software program or a piece of machinery.

Let us say that God created us for a purpose and we fail that purpose. Apart from the fact that this shows God is a sloppy creator because our imperfections are directly the result of his lack of skills in creating perfect humans, why does he just not return us to nothingness if he sees we do not serve his purpose? Why does he torture us in this excruciating way for eternity? This is stupid. It takes really stupid people to believe in this BS. If we use just a little bit of logic, we can see Muhammad was a liar and everything he said make no sense.

Assuming that something is wrong with us and we do not serve our creator's purpose, all he has to do is discard us. Why this much venom? Why this much vengeance?

Furthermore, if he is an all-knowing god, why did he create those whom he knew would disobey him? If I know a software or a machine that I am making is not going to work the way I want it to work, I will not make it. If Allah knew the future, why did he make those whom he knew would disobey? Isn't this sick to create disbelievers and then torture them for eternity? All he had to do was not create those whom he knew would become disbeliever.

No, no... I didn't give you a reason to say "is god imperfect in programming us?" That was just an example I gave you to refute your reasoning above and tell you what YOU would do if you had created something. This is because no matter how hard you may try, you cannot enable a computer program to make a decision on its own. God has the power to do it and hence he has introduced punishment for disobedience.

And you have no problem believing in this nonsense? That is pathetic? That is why I say religion destroys the brain.

You wrote: "*Let us say God created me. But he does not take care of me. I am left in this world to fend for myself. I have faced calamities that could have been avoided if God was looking over my shoulders. I would die of hunger if I do not earn my own bread. Tens of thousands of children die every day of hunger. Where is this loving god to come to their rescue? He is nowhere to be found when we are in need. Our prayers and supplications are never heard. I am by all means kinder to my cat than God is to me. And yet I can love my cat unconditionally without wanting him to worship me or thank me. God is incapable of loving his creation unconditionally. He put us in this world without consulting us. Here we have to face life with all its difficulties and pains on our own. He takes away our loved ones and fills our hearts with great sorrow. He shatters our hopes. He sends one calamity after another and kills innocent people by thousands and despite all that he wants us to worship him and serve him. Why should we thank such a god? What do we owe him? We owe him nothing! He does not deserve our respect. Such a needy, petulant and abusive god deserves our scorn. The god of Muhammad is sick. He is a psychopath*".

The whole statement above is based on immaturity that I have already refuted. You feel cursed because you ignored that death is NOT the end of life. This is a separate point that you may like to discuss later. If a person dying in hunger gets a hundreds of thousands of times better life than this one, what do you think God is showing? Ruthlessness or reward?

So, childish again. You should attempt to speak against what God does to us in this life only if you know what happens after the death.

You have refuted nothing. All you have proven is that your brain is on religion and as such it is incapable of rational thought.

You wrote: "*The truth is that Allah is Muhammad's own alter ego. He is everything the narcissist Muhammad wanted to be. He does what he pleases and he responds to no authority above him. He wants to be worshipped, obeyed and feared. This is the wet dream of all narcissists. One must be naïve to believe that the maker of this universe is this insane god described by Muhammad. Why would one who owns this magnificent universe care if a bunch of evolved apes in this tiny plant worship him or not? Can we really hurt the feelings of the maker of this vast universe by simply disbelieving in him? There are many holes in the concept of god as defined by the illiterate self-proclaimed prophet of Arabia*".

The audience is here to decide if I have rightly answered comments like those above already. Yet I want to add two things here. 1) A narcissist would rather want to pass a luxurious life and would be able to gather many more greedy individuals around on the promise of a luxurious life after a luxurious life. Muhammad (pbuh), on the contrary, spent quite a simple, hard and selfless life.

Muhammad became the absolute potentate of Arabia. In Mecca he destroyed the wealth of his wife and when he escaped to Medina he was poor. In just ten years he owned the wealth of thousands of people that he raided, murdered or banished. What other proof you need to agree that he benefited immensely by fooling people? The Christians can say Jesus did not benefit materially and was killed for what he stood for. Muslims can't say that about Muhammad because he benefited materially from his claim. He became the absolute ruler and filled his harem with a bevy of young women. It is precisely because of this that we should question his motives.

On the other hand, an atheist can rightly be called a narcissist, as according to your definition above in the following words: He does what he pleases and he responds to no authority above him. He wants to be worshipped, obeyed and feared. This is the wet dream of all narcissists.

This is not what atheists do. Atheists (with the exception of the communists who have their atheistic religion) believe in the rule of law, a law that applies to all humans equally.

2) Whether Muhammad (pbuh) is a self-proclaimed prophet is a matter of later concern. Don't try to color up your speech using hasty hops. We shall come to it in the next step, inshaAllah. (Don't repeat that the main aim of the site is to target Muhammad (pbuh) only. I have already addressed on this baseless claim under point A above (top))

You failed to say anything worth reading. I am sorry Abdur Rafay. I thought you are a scholar. Obviously I judged you too

soon. Your responses are neither challenging nor intelligent. Please post your responses in the forum and continue debating with the friends there. I am not going to waste the precious time of my readers by making them read silly arguments. If you have anything important and ground breaking to say, you can say it in the forum and people will flock to read your pearls of wisdom.

If you say that the actual God is an indefinable and incomprehensible reality, how can you say what characteristics He does not have? It is quite logical for such a God to have bestowed some of His qualities to a trivial degree to human beings that now have become “human qualities” as you call them. Be logical. A human quality is not supposed to be owned by God; rather human beings can be supposed to be granted some of His qualities. Simple.

Obviously, this subject is a bit above your head. So you did not understand when I said God is a principle and not a thing or a being and as such It cannot have attributes. Why should I waste my time debating with someone of your caliber?

Let us suppose your definition of god above suggests that god is FREE from all these attributes. He must therefore be free of life as well. If it is true, the most illogical statement that “a non living being created living beings” is what you just said.

My friend, please ask someone to explain to you what I wrote.

If god is a principle, fine. No problem. This principle has caused life. And thus the principle is alive too. Otherwise, this goes against known logic as I said above. This is the point where the actual debate starts.

Dear Abdur Rafay, your logic is not the standard. You don't know what logic is. You simply did not understand a word of what I wrote. Principles do not have life. Principles are laws. This concept seems to be beyond you. Isn't it?

We are unable, rather incapable to understand what God is like. The question here is whatever God is, has he initiated communication with us? My answer here is yes. The proof to this communication is Quran. I hope here is where the second phase of this debate starts. As I have already mentioned that my intention is to reach the ultimate truth and not to defend Islam (it doesn't need to be defended), I put forward two things in the conclusion:

1. The HE and IT debate is childish. When you can call your cat "he" (who is an animal) you chose "it" for God (even if He is a Principle according to you). Remember, on the other hand you call God a supreme reality. I do agree that Allah is free of gender and the use of "he" denotes that He is alive and not the gender. "Subhaan Allah i amma yasifoon." (Allah is pure of the attributes they suggest for Him)
 2. To me, God has communicated to human beings and the last book of signs He has sent to us is Quran.
-

Please go in the forum and debate there. I have more important things to do than debating with someone with your limited understanding. Not only you have no understanding of philosophy and are not familiar with logical language, you have difficulty understanding simple concepts. Now I see why Doubtless had ignored your email and had not tagged it for me to see. Obviously, he saw your shallowness when I failed to see it.